REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action mailed February 20, 2009, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claim 10 is amended to more clearly define Applicants' invention. No new matter is introduced by way of this amendment. Accordingly, claims 10 and 12-17 are before the Examiner, of which claim 10 is in independent form.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 10 and 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the while the part spherical bearing is immovably mounted on the one support member, the bearing may be moved within the seat. Applicants have amended claim 10 to specify that the part spherical bearing is "mounted on one support member such that the universal joint cannot move relative to said support member." Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 10 and 12-17 is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 10, 12-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Bosson (U.S. Patent No. 6,863,252).

As amended, claim 10 is directed to a support for an electrical display device including

> a pair of support members connected by a universal joint comprising a ***part spherical bearing*** mounted on one support member such that the universal joint cannot move relative to said support member, the part spherical bearing being received within a ***bearing seat*** pivotally mounted to the other support member ***to enable relative movement between the bearing and the bearing seat in any direction*** and, between the bearing seat and the other support member about a pivot axis, wherein the bearing seat comprises a ***looped element*** having opposite ends and an ***arcuate***

> ***bearing surface*** extending therebetween, wherein said looped element loops around the part-spherical bearing with said arcuate bearing surface in ***sliding contact*** with the part-spherical bearing such that ***said looped element and part-spherical bearing can move relative to each other in any direction, said opposite ends of the looped element being attached to said other support member to close the looped element around the part-spherical bearing and so that the arcuate bearing surface exerts a compressive force against the part spherical bearing***, said opposite ends of the looped element also being attached to said other support member so as to enable rotation of said other support member and the looped element relative to each other about the pivot axis.

The Examiner asserts that Bosson discloses a support as claimed, including the part spherical bearing and the bearing seat having the loop element. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Bosson does not disclose a "part-spherical bearing" as set forth in amended claim 10. As previously argued, the bearing 83 is "disc-shaped." The Examiner asserts that "if the sides are rounded it will be spherical" and that "the bearing taught by Bosson could be made into a spherical shape by rounding the edges and therefore has a part-spherical shape." Applicants submit that the Examiner is admitting that Bosson does not disclose a part spherical bearing since the disk-shaped bearing 83 must be modified by rounding the edges in order to make the bearing spherical or part spherical. Nor does Bosson disclose an arcuate bearing surface extending between opposite ends of the looped element. Thus, the bearing and bearing seat arrangement disclosed in Bosson cannot anticipate amended claim 10 as suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action.

In addition, amended claim 10 requires that it is possible to move the bearing and the bearing seat relative to each other in any direction. However, in Bosson, the bearing seat is provided by the two-shell halves 70 that close over the bearing 83 and are connected through the bearing 83 by a bolt 77. Thus, the bearing can rotate relative to the shell halves about a single pivot axis defined by the longitudinal axis of the bolt. Thus, the shell halves 70 do not form part of the bearing and further do not provide or

otherwise enable motion in any direction between the shell halves and the yoke. And even if the Examiner considers that the shell halves 70 form part of the bearing, which Applicants disagree, the shell halves are not mounted to the yoke 61 in such a manner so as to allow movement in any direction. The shell halves can only pivot relative to the yoke. Therefore, in Bosson, movement in any direction between the bearing and bearing seat is not possible.

In order to more clearly define the invention, claim 10 is further amended to specify that the opposite ends of the looped element are attached to the other support member to close the looped element around the part-spherical bearing so that the arcuate bearing surface exerts a compressive force against the part spherical bearing. Again, this feature is not disclosed, shown or suggested in Bosson. As described above, the yoke 61, which the Examiner equates to Applicants' bearing seat in the Office Action, is spaced from the bearing and has open ends. Thus, Bosson fails to disclose the loop element as defined by Applicants in amended claim 10.

For the reasons set forth herein, amended claim 10 is submitted as being patentable over the references of record, including Bosson. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 12-15 and 17, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 10, are submitted as being patentable for the same reasons provided for claim 10.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 16 was indicated by the Examiner to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants appreciate the allowance of claim 16, and have withheld amending this claim until consideration by the Examiner of the arguments provided for the allowance of amended claim 10.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, consideration and favorable action are respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this Preliminary Amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, or otherwise has any questions regarding the application, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' Attorney at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

By:_____/Keith F. Noe/_____

Keith F. Noe, Esq. (Reg. No. 34,686)
LOWRIE, LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP
Riverfront Office Park
One Main Street
Cambridge, MA 02142
Tel.: (617) 395-7039
Fax: (617) 395-7070
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: April 20, 2009
Attorney Docket No.: C2028-7000US

938674.1